

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, amended claim 16 (formerly the second claim 15 at the top of page 22), and 23 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 9, amended claim 16, and 23.

Attorney Docket Number

Please amend the attorney docket number to read "03226/507001; P6087" instead of "SUN-P6087".

Oath/Declaration

As discussed during a telephone conference with Examiner Alicia Baturay on January 3, 2005, the oath and declaration are not defective and are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a). Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Specification Objections

The amendments to the specification that were suggested by the Examiner have been made. Further, the specification has been amended to remove the use of the trademark iPlanet™. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 has been amended in this reply to correct the informality. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1 - 3, 5, 9 - 15, and 23 - 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as obvious over U.S. Publication Number 2002/0068554 ("Dusse"). The present invention provides a wireless server that automatically detects a wireless client. Specifically, the invention provides a mechanism for identifying wireless clients connected to the wireless server by using specific characteristics of the client. Further, the detection mechanism is capable of being extended by the client to add client information characteristics that are *not* pre-stored in the wireless server. This allows the client detection logic to be extensible without requiring software version updates or complex programming tasks.

The Examiner asserts that Dusse teaches that one of the services comprises automatic client type detection using extensible parameters. However, Dusse actually teaches an application that allows a user to select desired device features and parameters for a known wireless client type (*see* Dusse pg. 3 paragraph [0036]). Dusse does not teach that one of the services comprises automatic client type detection using extensible parameters as recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, the present invention provides the capability to actually extend the client information characteristics stored in the wireless server for a new wireless client (*see*, for example, page 13, lines 7-12 and page 16, lines 13-24 of the instant specification). Clearly, the selecting of desired device features and parameters taught in Dusse is not the same as the automatic client type detection using extensible parameters recited in the claims of present invention.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Dusse teaches a wireless client data storage coupled to the extensible wireless client aware detector by using a Registration Module (*see* Dusse, Fig. 4, element 444). The Registration Module taught by Dusse only coordinates the processing of the provisioning request in terms of verifying the request components and matching the requested device features and services with available features and services. In contrast, the present invention (as discussed above in relation to claim 1 and as recited in independent claim 9) provides the capability to actually extend the client information characteristics stored in the wireless server for a new wireless client (*see*, for example, page 13, lines 7-12 and page 16, lines 13-24 of the instant specification). Clearly, the Registration Module taught in Dusse does not teach the wireless session service coupled to the extensible wireless aware detector as taught in

the present invention. In fact, the Registration Module does not even contemplate the concept of extending characteristics.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that Dusse teaches parsing header information in the wireless client service requests to automatically extract client specific information and comparing the client specific information to extensible parameters in order to detect the wireless client that is attempting to connect to the wireless server. Actually, Dusse simply teaches verifying a mobile device using a *pre-stored* device identification number and other required user information such as a credit card (*see* Dusse pg. 4, paragraph [0042]). Dusse does not teach the capability to extend client information characteristics stored in the wireless server for a new wireless client, as recited in claim 23 of the present invention and discussed above in relation to claims 1 and 9.

In view of the above, Dusse fails to teach the present invention as recited in claims 1, 9 and 23. Thus, claims 1, 9, and 23 are patentable over Dusse. Claims that depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 9, and 23 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6 - 8, 16, 18 - 22, and 26 - 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Dusse in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6, 397, 259 ("Lincke"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

For the same reasons cited in the above arguments regarding claims 1, 9, and 23, Dusse also fails to teach an automatic detection system coupled to access the plurality of extensible definition files. The definition files of the present invention have the capability to extend client definition files for a particular wireless client as recited in claim 16 (*see*, for example, page 14, line 24 - page 15, line 2 of the instant specification). Accordingly, claim 16 (which is directed towards similar subject matter as claims 1, 9, and 23) is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Likewise, the Examiner asserts that Lincke teaches a plurality of extensible definition files, each definition file for providing detection for a class of wireless clients that communicate with the wireless server system. However, Lincke does not teach what the Examiner asserts; instead Lincke teaches that header information included in a standard HTTP request is used to convey information (*see* Lincke col. 65, lines 28-40). The present invention uses more than just

the information found in a standard HTTP request to perform automatic detection (*see*, for example, page 14, lines 17-22 and page 15, lines 16-18 of the instant specification). Clearly, the header information taught in Lincke is not equivalent to the extensible definition file as recited in claims 4, 6 - 8, 16, 18 - 22, and 26 - 29 in the present invention.

In view of the above, Dusse and Lincke, whether considered separately or together, fail to teach the present invention as recited in claims 4, 6 - 8, 16, 18 - 22, and 26 - 29. Thus, claims 4, 6 - 8, 16, 18 - 22, and 26 - 29 are patentable over Dusse in further view of Lincke. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

No basis or reasoning was offered by the Examiner for rejecting claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant contends that claim 17 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 16, from which it depends, is allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226.507001).

Dated: February 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord

Registration No.: 46,479

(713) 228-8600

(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant